

University of Dayton
eCommons

[All Committee Minutes](#)

[Academic Senate Committees](#)

3-24-2017

Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2017-03-24

University of Dayton. Faculty Affairs Committee

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Faculty Affairs Committee, "Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2017-03-24" (2017). *All Committee Minutes*. 294.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/294

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate Committees at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlengen1@udayton.edu.

Minutes of the Faculty Affairs Committee meeting held 24 March 2017

Meeting time: 11:00 – 12:30

Location: Library 205

Present: Andrea Seielstad, Emily Hicks, Joel Whitaker, Caroline Merithew, Carissa Krane, Deo Eustace, Kevin Kelly, Mark Jacobs, Paul Vanderburgh (ex officio), Carolyn Roecker Phelps (ex officio)

Excused: Ann Biswas

Points of discussion:

1. Approved minutes of prior meeting with minor edit as to name spelling.
2. Discussed whether (a) a unified policy is appropriate, addressing outside employment and additional university services, or (b) there should be separate policies pertaining to outside employment, work for the university, and compensation.
 - a. After much discussion, most members thought that there should be separate policies
3. Discussed the “Outside employment and additional services” policy as presently published in the faculty handbook and the draft “Faculty supplemental salary policy” prepared by Carolyn Roecker Phelps. This draft includes an articulation of what has been referred to as “the 100 % rule.”
 - a. Members reviewed concerns with the policy and noted that these concerns are consistent with the concerns expressed by faculty when the policy was discussed and voted down in the context of senate document 2012-10.
 - i. Specific issues of concern summarized by way of group consensus are the 8-hour threshold and when exceptions are made; the issue of approval vs. reporting; conflict of interest vs. conflict of commitment; and the lack of an appeals process.
 - ii. There was some concern articulated about the perceived benefit or futility of proceeding with recommendations when the university ignored the Senate’s previous vote, but some members thought there was reason to believe the new administration and/or experience in actually implementing the policy present an opportunity to make changes.
4. Option 1: make incremental changes to the policy/guidelines now or Option 2: Undertake a rewrite of the policy modeled after strategic visioning given the different administration and campus climate.

Respectfully submitted by Emily Hicks